UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

RICHARD D. BURNS, Plaintiff

v.

05 cv 1 Q 9 7 3 GAO

ROADS CORPORATION, &
JOHN SARAO, JR., PRESIDENTIATE JUDGE
ROADS CORPORATION
Defendants

AMOUNT \$ 95
SUMMONS ISSUED VES
LOCAL RULE 4.1
WAIVER FORM
MCF ISSUED

COMPLAINT

This action is commenced by RICHARD D. BURNS (hereafter "Burns" or "Plaintiff") against ROADS CORPORATION and JOHN SARAO, JR.- PRESIDENT-ROADS CORPORATION (hereafter "Employer"; "Company"; or "Defendant"), in order to remedy and seek relief for the Defendants' unlawful and discriminatory employment practices, in violation of Title I of the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. §§12001 et seq., the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. Sections 12001 et seq., in addition to other federal, state, and common law claims.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 1. Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§451, 1331, 1337, 1343, and 1345. This action is authorized and instituted pursuant to, inter alia, §107(a) of the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA), 42 U.S.C. §12117 (a), which incorporates by reference §§706(f)(1), and pertinent provisions of the ADEA, 29 USC, s621-634. All conditions precedent to establishing this court's jurisdiction have been satisfied. Jurisdiction is also invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C.A. Section 1331 and 29 U.S.C. 1132(e), with respect to issues arising under federal statutory law.
- 2. Considerations of judicial economy, convenience, and fairness to the litigants warrant exercise of this court's supplemental jurisdiction with respect to

Plaintiff's state law claims. Plaintiff's state claims are so related to Plaintiff's federal claims that they form part of the same case or controversy. This court has supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's state law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 1367(a).

- Venue is proper in this district pursuant to, inter alia, 28 USC 1391 (b, 3. because:
- a. The alleged unlawful practices occurred and/or are continuing to occur with the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and in this judicial district;
- b. All records relevant to the alleged unlawful practices are maintained and administered in the Defendant's place of business in this judicial district; and
- c. Plaintiff would currently be enjoying all rights, benefits, and privileges of his employment, as a full-time employee of Defendant, at its place of business in this judicial district, but for the Defendant's unlawful practices.
- On or about August 31, 2004 Burns timely filed a formal Charge of 4. Discrimination with the Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination ("MCAD") and the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC"), alleging that he had been subjected to unlawful discrimination and related retaliation on the basis of his disability and age (MCAD #: 04BEM2538 and EEOC #: 16CA402570). (Exhibit A)
- 5. In timely fashion, Burns requested Right To Sue authorization from the appropriate administrative agency(ies), and has filed this action within ninety (90) days of his receipt of the appropriate notification(s), and has fulfilled all other conditions precedent to the institution of each count of this action (Exhibit B).

PARTIES

- 6. The Plaintiff, Richard D. Burns, an individual, is a citizen and resident of the Town of Tewksbury, Massachusetts.
- 7. On information and belief, Defendant Roads Corporation is a domestic corporation, conducting business pursuant to the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and maintaining a facility and principal place of business in Massachusetts, located at 241 Treble Cove Rd., N. Billerica, MA. 01862. On information and belief, Defendant John Sarao, Jr. is the President of Roads Corporation. In addition to Defendant Sarao's statutory liability in his individual capacity, the Defendants are sufficiently joined and intertwined in terms of ownership, corporate direction, financial matters, workplace policies and practices, and other common indicia of ownership and control to be determined a single employer or, in the alternative, joint employers for the purposes of all claims at issue in this action, and to be held jointly and severally liable.
- 8. At all times material to the allegations of this Complaint, the Defendants have continuously, and do now, employ at least 100 or more employees in the

- At all times material to the allegations of this Complaint, the Defendants 11. qualified as an employer and/or has been a covered entity pursuant to applicable provisions of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. 2000e—2000e-17 et seq., and M.G.L.A. Ch. 151B, and any other state or federal statutes referenced in this Complaint, as well as under §101(2) of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. §12117(2), and pertinent provisions of the ADEA, 29 USC. Defendants at all times pertinent to this action was an employer within the meaning of M.G.L.A. CH. 151B, and all other provisions pertinent to this action.
- 12. At all times material to the allegations of this Complaint, Burns was and is an "individual" within the meaning of 42 U.S.C. 2000e-2(a); qualifies as a person with a disability under 42 U.S.C. 12112(a); and is otherwise covered as an individual and/or an employee under the provisions of M.G.L.A. CH. 151B. At all times material to this action, Burns was a "handicapped person" within the meaning of M.G.L.A. CH. 151B; an "employee" under M.G.L.A. CH.151B, and was protected under the provisions of M.G.L.A. CH. 151B.
- Burns held the status of a person with a disability, as defined in §3(2) of 13. the ADA, 42 U.S.C. 12102, and pursuant to pertinent state law, because he:
 - has a physical or emotional impairment that substantially limits a. one or more of her major life activities;
 - has a record of such an impairment; and/or b.
 - is and was regarded by the Defendants as having such an c. impairment.
- 14. On information and belief, and at all times pertinent to this Complaint. managers and supervisors engaging in discriminatory workplace treatment of the Plaintiff, were each a person acting in furtherance of the interest of, on behalf of, and as the agent of the Defendants, with respect to all allegations of this Complaint, and the Defendants knew or should reasonably have known of their unlawful conduct.

FACTS COMMON TO ALL COUNTS

- 15. At the time of the events pertinent to this Complaint, Plaintiff was 62-63 years of age (DOB 11/22/41).
- 16. Plaintiff was employed by the Defendants for approximately four years until his termination, on or about May 17, 2004.
- 17. During the tenure of Plaintiff's employment, Plaintiff was able to perform all of his duties in a satisfactory manner, meeting or exceeding the Employers' legitimate expectations. .
- 18. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff was the oldest person in the Defendants' employ.
- 19. During November, 2003, the Defendants took away Plaintiff's position as Director of Operations, and gave it to a less-experienced person, approximately 10 years younger than Plaintiff, and someone who did not have a disability or medical impairment.
- 20. Shortly thereafter, in December, 2003, Plaintiff was told by the Employer's President that he needed to take a "rest," and Plaintiff was involuntarily laid off.
- 21. At this time, Plaintiff suffered from a heart condition and diabetes, which was known by the Employer.

- 22. At all times material to the allegations of this Complaint, Plaintiff was able, with or without reasonable accommodation, to perform the essential functions of his position.
- 23. Plaintiff was permitted to return to work in March, 2004, and within a few weeks, on or about May 17, 2004, was terminated. Plaintiff was terminated for the false and pretextual reason of allegedly leaving his post, a fabrication to conceal the Defendants' true motive of discrimination based on Plaintiff's age and disability status and/or the fact that the Defendants regarded him as having a disability.
- 24. The Defendants' conduct reflects, in both purpose and effect, a blatant, willful, and/or malicious pattern of discrimination and unlawful treatment against the Plaintiff. Such conduct has involved an intentional, reckless, and/or callous indifference to the statutorily protected rights of the Plaintiff. The Defendants knowingly and purposefully subjected the Plaintiff to humiliating, discriminatory, and retaliatory treatment, and terminated him, as a result of his disability status and/or age.
- 25. The wrongful actions by Defendants and its agents complained of herein were taken without justification, excuse, or defense, but rather were taken in a purposefully discriminatory and unlawful manner, and have caused the Plaintiff lost active employment, lost wages, lost benefits, humiliation, embarrassment, emotional and physical harm, and other damages.

COUNT I AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT ADA-42 U.S.C. §12117

Discriminatory Terms and Conditions of Employment Failure To Accommodate Retaliation **Discriminatory Termination**

26. Paragraphs 1-25 above are incorporated herein by reference in their entirety.

- 27. At all times material to the allegations of this Complaint, Burns was a qualified individual with a disability within the meaning of ADA, in that he had a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more of his major life's activities, had a record of such an impairment, and/or was regarded by Defendants as having such an impairment.
- 28. Despite his disability or impairment, Burns was able to perform the essential duties of his position, either with no need for accommodation or with reasonable accommodation.
- 29. The Defendants has engaged in unlawful employment practices in violation of the ADA §§ 102(a), 102(b)(1) and 102(b)(5)(B), 42 U.S.C. §§12112(a), 12112(b)(1) and 12112(b)(5)(B), in addition to other sections.
- 30. The unlawful practices engaged in by the Defendants include, but are not limited to, Defendants' conduct in refusing to accommodate Plaintiff, forcing the Plaintiff to work under discriminatory terms and conditions of employment, retaliating against Plaintiff, and terminating the Plaintiff.
- 31. But for the Defendants' intent to discriminate against Burns because of his status as a qualified person with a disability, Defendants would not have engaged in the conduct referenced in this Complaint.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered herein against Defendants, jointly and severally, and in favor of Plaintiff for all damages and equitable relief available, as hereinafter requested.

COUNT II
M.G.L.A. CH. 151B, et seq.
DISCRIMINATORY TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF EMPLOYMENT
DISCRIMINATORY TERMINATION

FAILURE AND REFUSAL TO ACCOMMODATE RETALIATION

- 32. The allegations contained in paragraphs 1-25 above are incorporated herein by reference in their entirety.
- 33. The Defendants' discriminatory conduct, policies, and practices are violative of the provision of the M.G.L.A. CH. 151B et seq., by:
 - interfering with Plaintiff's right to avail himself of the full and a. equal benefit and protection of state and federal laws intended to prevent discrimination in the workplace based on disability and age;
 - b. depriving him of the status, benefits, privileges, and other terms and conditions accruing to the employment relationship to which he was entitled;
 - treating him in a hostile, demeaning, and otherwise unlawful c. manner based on his disability and age; and
 - causing him lost income and benefits, humiliation, physical and d. emotional injury, a well as harm to his personal and professional reputation.
- 33. The unlawful practices engaged in by the Defendants were motivated by impermissible and unlawful considerations concerning Burns' status as a qualified employee with a disability and his age. Such practices include, but are not limited to, Defendants':
 - terminating Burns because of his disability status and age; a.
 - b. refusing to reasonably accommodate Burns;
 - forcing Burns to work under discriminatory terms and conditions of c. employment; and
 - d. retaliating against Burns for asserting his rights to be free from discrimination based on disability and age; and for opposing practices forbidden under M.G.L.A. CH. 151B, including, but not limited to §4(4).

- 35. But for the Defendants' intent to discriminate against Plaintiff because of his disability status and age, Defendants would not have terminated Plaintiff, subjected him to discriminatory terms and conditions of employment, or failed to provide him a reasonable accommodation, or terminated him.
- 36. The Defendants purposefully, maliciously, and without justification or excuse, took discriminatory action with respect to Plaintiff's employment because of Plaintiff's disability status and age. The Defendants' conduct has unlawfully deprived Plaintiff of his active employment, income, benefits, privileges, promotions, and other terms and conditions accruing to the employment relationship to which he was entitled; has caused harm to his reputation; and has caused him humiliation, as well as physical and/or emotional injury.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered herein against Defendants, jointly and severally, and in favor of Plaintiff for all damages and equitable relief available, as hereinafter requested.

COUNT III AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT ACT 29 U.S.C. s 621 ET SEQ.

Discriminatory Termination Discriminatory Terms and Conditions of Employment

- 37. Paragraphs 1-25 above are incorporated herein, by reference, in their entirety.
- 38. The Defendants' conduct, as otherwise referenced in paragraphs 1-25 above was solely by an intent to discriminate against Plaintiff on the basis of his age, in violation of the ADEA, 29 U.S.C. s 621 et seq.

- 39. The Defendants' conduct, as otherwise referenced in paragraphs 1-25, above, was motivated in part by an intent to discriminate against the Plaintiff on the basis of his age, in violation of the ADEA, 29 U.S.C. s621 et seq.
- 40. The conduct by the Defendants referenced in paragraph 1-25, above, represents a willful violation of section 4(a)(1) and (2) of the ADEA, 29 U.S.C. section 623 (a)(1) and (2), and other sections, by continuously maintaining age-based employment policies which have the intended objective of excluding qualified employees, including Plaintiff, from employment opportunities, solely on the basis of age.
- 41. Defendants willfully engaged in a policy or practice of arbitrarily and summarily discriminating against employees in the protected age category, including Plaintiff, in violation of the ADEA, 29 USC section 621 et seq.
- 42. The Defendants' discriminatory conduct, policies, and practices regarding workplace treatment, compensation, promotion and retention are violative of the provisions of the ADEA, 29 USC section 621 et seq., by:
 - interfering with Plaintiff's right to avail himself to the full and equal benefit and protection of state and federal laws intended to prevent discrimination in the workplace based on age;
 - b.) depriving him of the status, benefits, privileges, and other terms and conditions accruing to the employment relationship to which he was entitled;
 - c.) treating his in a hostile, demeaning, and otherwise unlawful manner based on his age; and

- d.) causing him lost income and benefits, humiliation, physical and emotional injury, as well as irreparable harm to his personal and professional reputation.
- 43. The unlawful practices engaged in by the Defendants were motivated by impermissible and unlawful considerations concerning Plaintiff's age. Such practices included, but were not limited to, Defendants'
 - terminating Plaintiff because of his age; a.)
 - subjecting Plaintiff to discriminatory terms and conditions b.) of employment due to his age; &
 - c.) retaliating against Plaintiff for asserting his right to be free from discrimination based on age.
- But for the Defendants' intent to discriminate against Plaintiff because of his age, Defendants would not have terminated Plaintiff or subjected him to discriminatory terms and conditions of employment.
- 45. The Defendants' conduct has unlawfully deprived Plaintiff of income, benefits, privileges, promotions, and other terms and conditions accruing to the employment relationship to which he was entitled; has caused irreparable harm to his reputation and professional mobility; and has caused him extreme humiliation, as well as physical and emotional injury.
- 46. By its conduct, the Defendants have failed in its affirmative duty under the ADEA, by its failure to exercise reasonable care and diligence, to maintain a work environment free of discrimination against workers in the protected age category.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that the judgment be entered herein against Defendants, jointly and severally, and in favor of the Plaintiff for all damages and equitable relief available, as hereinafter requested.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered herein against Defendants, jointly and severally, and in favor of Plaintiff for all damages and equitable relief available, including, but not limited to:

- a. an order that Defendants institute and carry out policies, practices and programs which provide equal employment opportunities to qualified individuals regardless of disability status;
- b. an order that the Defendants make whole the Plaintiff with appropriate lost earnings, benefits, and interest, in amounts to be proved at trial, and other affirmative relief necessary to eradicate the effects of its unlawful employment practices, including, but not limited to the reinstatement of Plaintiff to his position of active employment, or some other appropriate position, with appropriate increases, benefits status, and promotional opportunities;
- c. an order that the Defendants make whole the Plaintiff by providing compensation for any pecuniary losses, including, but not limited to, any costs incurred for health and life insurance premiums, medical treatment while without insurance, losses in pension entitlement, vacation pay and other benefits, and the costs of seeking new employment, in amounts to be determined at trial;
- d. an order that the Defendants make whole the Plaintiff by providing compensation for non-pecuniary losses, including, but not limited to emotional pain, suffering, humiliation, and mental anguish in amounts to be proven at trial, including an appropriate award of compensatory damages;
- e. grant attorney's fees and the costs of this action;
- grant punitive damages, as appropriate, to punish the Defendants for its malicious conduct and/or for its reckless and/or callous indifference to the statutorily protected rights of the Plaintiff;

- g. grant an appropriate award of prejudgment interest, including an award of interest for all damages awarded to the Plaintiff from the date this cause of action accrued;
- h. any and all penalties and damages available pursuant to state or federal statute; and
- i. grant such further relief as this Court deems necessary and proper.

DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY

Plaintiff hereby demands trial by jury of all issues pertinent to the causes in the Complaint as of right by jury.

Respectfully Submitted,

Richard D. Burns By His Attorney,

Stephen Tl. Fanning #542343

305 South Main Street Providence, RI 02903

401-245-5802

401-245-4520 (FAX)

Case 1:05-cv-10973-GAO Document 1 - Filed 05/11/200 This form is affected by the Privacy of 1974; See Privacy Act Statement before completing this form.	Page 14 of 15
MASSACHUSETTS COMMISSION AGAINST DISCRIMINATION	ON and FEOG
State or local Agency, if any	and EEOC
NAME (Indicate Kr., A. & Kor X)	HOKE TELEPHONE (Include Area Code)
RICHARD D. BURNS	978-692-0192
74 PARKHURST DR, WESTFORD, MA 01886	DATE OF BIRTH 11/22/41
NAMED IS THE EMPLOYER, LABOR ORGANIZATION, ERPLOYMENT AGENCE STATE OR LOCAL GOVERNMENT AGENCY WHO DISCRIMINATED AGAINST	
	PENDERS TELEPHONE (Include Area Code)
STREET ADDRESS CITY, STATE AND ZIP CODE	COUNTY
241 TREBLE COVE ROAD N. BILLERICA, MA 01862	MiddleseX ITELEPHONE NUMBER (Include Area Code)
JOHN SARAO, JR., PRESIDENT - Roads Corporation	978-663- 9700
STREET ADDRESS CITY, STATE AND ZIP CODE	соикту Middlesex
241 TREBLE COVE ROAD N. BILLERICA, MA 01862 CAUSE OF DISCRIMINATION BASED ON (Check appropriate box(es))	DATE DISCRIMINATION TOOK PLACE
RACE COLOR SEX RELIGION NATIONAL ORIGIN	EARLIEST LATEST
RETALIATION MAGE MOISABILITY OTHER (Specity)	11/15/03
	CONTINUING ACTION
THE PARTICULARS ARE (If additional space is meeded, attach extra sheet(s)):	c.dimatoly
I was employed by the above-referenced employer	for approximately
community my termination on or about May	y 1/, 2004. I was
town an Naviombon 22 10/11 and Was h2-h1 Vedis t	of ade on the acce
	the didear berson in
the Respondent's employ. During November, 2003	and it to a less-
away my position as Director of Operations, and	son than me Shortly
experienced person, approximately 10 years youn	o omployer's President
thereafter, in December, 2003, I was told by th	untarily laid off. At
that I needed to take "a rest," and I was invol	diahetes, which was
that I needed to take a rest, and I had the this time I suffered from a heart condition and	s to perform the
known by the employer, but was able at all time	t reasonable
essential duties of my position, with or withou accommodation. I was permitted to return to wo	rk in March, 2004, and
within a few weeks, on or about May 17, 2004, w	as terminated. I was
terminated for the false and pretextual reason	of allegedly leaving my
fabrication to conceal the employer's u	rue motive oi
J 70 VIELIGARID been been been and disability Of I	ne ratt that the
r1on nogandod mó ac having a disability. I	the curployer 2 courages
if proven implicates violations of the America	US MISH DISCOLLIGICS
Act the Age Discrimination In Employment Act,	various sections of
M.G.L. 1518 and other state and federal laws.	
• ,	
XX I want this charge filed with both the EEOC and the State or NOTARY - (World Pol	FANNING GENERAL TRANSPORTER OF THE PROPERTY O
ical Agency, if any. I will advise the agencies if I change my	ion Expires 8/13/2001/2/40/17/10/7/8/
idress or telephone number and cooperate fully with them in the I swear or affirm the recessing of my charge in accordance with their procedures.	at I have read the above charge and that st of my knowledge, information and belief.
declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true SIGNATURE OF 60	
id correct.	IN B
(29/04 toay) const. and ye	SWORN TO BEFORE HE THIS DATE
Charging Party (Signature) (Signature)	Kg 0124.109

EEOC I	Form 161-B (3/98)	U.S. Equ	JAL EMPLOYMENT OPPO	ORTUNITY COMMISSION		
		NOTICE	OF RIGHT TO SUE (/	SSUED ON REQUEST)		
To:	Richard Burns 74 Parkhurst Driv Westford, MA 018			From: Boston Area Office John F. Kennedy Fo Government Ctr, Ro Boston, MA 02203		
		of person(s) aggrieved v ITIAL (29 CFR § 1601.				
Char	ge No.	EEOC	Representative		Telephone No.	
16C	-2004-02570		A. O'Quinn, cement Supervisor		(617) 565-3192	
				(See also the additional inform	·	form.)
	CE TO THE PERSON A					
unde the A	er Title VII and/or the NDA must be filed ir	ADA based on the a federal or state co	above-numbered charge. It h	abilities Act (ADA): This is your as been issued at your request. receipt of this Notice or your ri fferent.)	Your lawsuit under Tit	le VII or
	More than 1	80 days have passe	ed since the filing of this charg	ge.		
	Less than 1 be able to c	80 days have passe omplete its administ	d since the filing of this charg	ge, but I have determined that it days from the filing of the charg	is unlikely that the EEC e.	C will
	X The EEOC	is terminating its pro	cessing of this charge.			
	The EEOC	will continue to proce	ess this charge.			
until				he ADEA at any time from 60 da ne charge. In this regard, the pa		
				er the ADEA must be filed in f o ght to sue based on the above-r		
			dling of your ADEA case. Ho ate court under the ADEA at t	wever, if 60 days have passed this time.	since the filing of your o	harge,
in fe	deral or state court v	within 2 years (3 year	rs for willful violations) of the	ng an EEOC charge is not requir alleged EPA underpayment. Th île suit may not be collectible	is means that backpay	brought due for
If yo	u file suit based on	this charge, please s	send a copy of your court con	nplaint to this office.		- -
			On behalf of the	Commission	FEB 1 0 2005	and the same
			A Paris	Sprans	1 1 1 0 2003	*
Encl	iosure(s)	_	Robert L. S Area Office	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	(Date Mailed)	, <u>î</u>
cc:	ROADS CORPOR 241 Treble Cove North Billerica, M	Rd		Stephen T. Fanning The Law Office of Stephen 305 South Main Street Providence, Rhode Island 0	-	

J\$ 4	4	
(Re	r. 87	9 0)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

1 (a) PLAINTIFFS		DEFENDAN	ets -			
Richard D. Bu	Roads Corporation & John Sarao, Jr., President Roads Corporation					
(b) COUNTY OF RESIDENCE (EXCEP	e of first listed plantiff <u>Middle</u> T in U.S. Plantiff Cases)	NOTE: IN LAND	, (IN U.S	MAST LISTED DEFENDING PLAINTIFF CASES BIRLY ON CASES, LISE THE LOCATION OF T	THE	
	E. ADDRESS, AND TELEPHONE NUMBERS	ATTORNEYS OF	KNOWN	0		
Stephen T. Fa 305 S. Main S	nning #542343 treet (401)272-825	0		0		
Providence, RI			•		•	
IL BASIS OF JURIS	DICTION PLEE U. HOW BELOW	III. CITIZENSHIP		CIPAL PARTIES	An a gar	ind son
D 1 U.S. Government Publish	2 1 Federal Cuestion	(Fer Diversity Cases C	PTE DEF	10		
	(U.S. Government Not a Party)	Citizen of This State	21 21	incorporar Principal Plage	-	DEP
C 2 U.S. Government	© 4 Diversity Undicate Citizenship st	Chillen of Angiliar State	D2 D2	at Southers in This State Incorporated and Privilent Place	0 s	C:
Detendant	Paries in Hem III)			of Susiness in Another State		

Discriminatory employment practices based on age and disability in viol. of the ADA of 1990, 42 USC 12001 et seq and the ADEA.

CONTRACT	701	78	PORFESTURE / PENALTY	BANKBUPTCY	STHER STATUTES
118 majores 128 taples 128 taples 138 taples 158 flagroup of Despayment 158	PERSONAL MILITY C 910 Americ C 910 Americ Linking Linking Linking C 320 Americ Linking C 320 Americ Linking C 320 Feeton Employeen C 340 Americ Linking C 345 Indexes C 346 Oner Personal Linking C 346 Oner Personal Linking C 346 Oner Conf Region C 346 Oner Conf Region C 346 Oner Conf Region	PERSONAL BLAIRY 362 Persons micro- top statements 365 Persons micro- top statements Personal lowing Personal lowing Personal Lowing Personal Lowing Date One Person Date	STP Agrenates Day Day	### ARCHANGE 184 #### ARCHANGE 185 ###################################	C 400 Şinti Amayorayınını C 416 Amayorayınını C 416 Amayorayınını C 430 Santa diri Basting C 430 Santa diri Basting C 430 Santa diri Basting C 430 Santa diri Coray Organizatini C 470 Reprotor's Washington C 810 Santani C Santani C Santani C Santani C 470
VI. ORIGIN 2 1 Original Displaying	2 Removed from 0 3	•	N ONE BOX ONLY) Trans Reinstated or C S anoth Reopened (spec	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
VII. REQUESTED I COMPLAINT:	N CHECK IF THIS IS D UNDER ER.C.P. 23	A CLASS ACTION	DEMAND \$	Check YES only	# demended in complaint: LND: X蔡YES 日 NO
VIII. RELATED CA): - JUG	OGE	DOCKET NUMBER	

5/11/05

Hepken Fanneng # 542343

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

	CORY IN	WHICH THE CASE BELONGS BASED UPON THE NUMBERED NATURE OF SUIT CODE LISTED ON	THE CIV
COVE	R SHEET.	. (STE LOCAL RIEE 40.1(A)(I)).	
	ı.	560, 416, 476, R.11, REGARDLESS OF NATURE OF SUIT.	
<u> </u>	n,	195, 362, 460, 440, 441-444, 544, 550, 625, 716, 730, 730, 740, 790, 791, 528, 530, 840, 650, 890, 837-894, 895, 5 50.	
	ш.	110, 128, 130, 140, 151, 190, 210, 230, 340, 345, 296, 310, 312, 326, 330, 340, 345, 350, 353, 360, 362, 365, 370, 371, 380, 385, 450, 891.	
	ʻ1v.	220, 422, 423, 436, 460, 510, 530, 610, 620, 630, 640, 650, 660, 490, Bib, B61-865, 870, 871, 875, 960.	· · ·
	V.	150, 153, 153.	
TITL	None	MOBER, IP ANY, OF RELATED CASES. (SEE LOCAL RULE 40,1(E)).	
HAS	L PRIÒR J	iction between the same parties and rased on the same claim ever been filed in t	BIS COU
-	No		
		mplaint in this case question the constitutionality of an act of congress affe	CTING 1
		MPLAINT IN THIS CASE QUESTION THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF AN ACT OF CONGRESS AFFE	CTING 1
PUBL	IC INTERI		
PUBL IF SO	LETTRI OL LETT 21 ,	U.S.A. OR AN OFFICER, AGENT OR EMPLOYEE OF THE U.S. A PARTY? (SEE 28 USC 2403)	
Publ IF So IS th	ic interi , is the u is case r	usa. Or an officer, agent or employee of the U.S. a party? (See 28 USC 2403) Required to be heard and determined by a district court of three judges pursuan	
PUBL IF SO IS TH 28 US	IC INTERI , IS THE U IS CASE R C 22847	U.S.A. OR AN OFFICER, AGENT OR EMPLOYEE OF THE U.S. A PARTY? (SEE 28 USC 2403)	 n 10 n
PUBL IF SO IS TH 22 US DO A	ic interi , is the u is case r c iibi: <u>tl</u> partii	U.S.A. OR AN OFFICER, AGENT OR EMPLOYEE OF THE U.S. A PARTY? (SEE 28 USC 2403) REQUIRED TO BE HEARD AND DETERMINED BY A DISTRICT COURT OF THREE JUDGES PURSUAN NO	 IT TO TI
IF SO IS TH 28 US DO A COUN	AC INTERI , IS THE U IS CASE R C 2241, LL PARTIE VITY) - (SE	U.S.A. OR AN OFFICER, AGENT OR EMPLOYEE OF THE U.S. A PARTY? (SEE 28 USC 2403) REQUIRED TO BE HEARD AND DETERMINED BY A DISTRICT COURT OF THREE JUDGES PURSUAN NO ES IN THIS ACTION RESIDE IN THE CENTRAL SECTION OF THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS (1) EE LOCAL RULE 46.1(C)). YESOR IN THE WESTERN SECTION (1)	 IT TO TI
IF SO IS TH 28 US DO A COUN	AC INTERI , IS THE U IS CASE R C 2241, LL PARTIE VITY) - (SE	U.S.A. OR AN OFFICER, AGENT OR EMPLOYEE OF THE U.S. A PARTY? (SEE 28 USC 2403) REQUIRED TO BE HEARD AND DETERMINED BY A DISTRICT COURT OF THREE JUDGES PURSUAN NO	 IT TO TT VORCES
PUBL IF SO IS TH 28 US DO A COUNTERAN	IC INTERI , IS THE U IS CASE R C 22841 LL PARTIE VITY) - (SEI	U.S.A. OR AN OFFICER, AGENT OR EMPLOYEE OF THE U.S. A PARTY? (SEE 28 USC 2403) REQUIRED TO BE HEARD AND DETERMINED BY A DISTRICT COURT OF THREE JUDGES PURSUAN NO	VORCES
PUBL IF SO IS TH 22 US DO A COUT FRANCE DO A	IC INTERI , IS THE U IS CASE R C 2241; LL PARTIE VIY) - (SE IKLIN, HA	U.S.A. OR AN OFFICER, AGENT OR EMPLOYEE OF THE U.S. A PARTY? (SEE 28 USC 2403) REQUIRED TO BE HEARD AND DETERMINED BY A DISTRICT COURT OF THREE JUDGES PURSUAN NO	WORCES DEREST
PUBLIF SOL	IC INTERI , 15 THE U IS CASE R C 22841 LL PARTIE STY) - (SEI SKLIN, HA LL OF TH RUCT? Y	U.S.A. OR AN OFFICER, AGENT OR EMPLOYEE OF THE U.S. A PARTY? (SEE 28 USC 2403) REQUIRED TO BE HEARD AND DETERMINED BY A DISTRICT COURT OF THREE JUDGES PURSUAN NO	VORCES LEREST
PUBLIF SOL	IC INTERI , 15 THE U IS CASE R C 22841 LL PARTIE STY) - (SEI EKLIN, HA LL OF TH RUCT? Y	U.S.A. OR AN OFFICER, AGENT OR EMPLOYEE OF THE U.S. A PARTY? (SEE 28 USC 2403) REQUIRED TO BE HEARD AND DETERMINED BY A DISTRICT COURT OF THREE JUDGES PURSUAN NO	VORCES BERKSH ONS OF
PUBLIF SOL	IC INTERI , 15 THE U IS CASE R C 22841 LL PARTIE STY) - (SEI EKLIN, HA LL OF TH RUCT? Y	U.S.A. OR AN OFFICER, AGENT OR EMPLOYEE OF THE U.S. A PARTY? (SEE 28 USC 2403) REQUIRED TO BE HEARD AND DETERMINED BY A DISTRICT COURT OF THREE JUDGES PURSUAN NO	WORCES BERKSE ONS OF
PUBLIF SOLUTION IN WIN WILLIAM IN WILLIAM IN WILLIAM IN WILLIAM IN WILLIAM IN SOLUTION IN WILLIAM I	IC INTERI , IS THE U IS CASE R C 2241 LL PARTIE RLIN, HA LL OF TH RUCT! PLAINTIF	U.S.A. OR AN OFFICER, AGENT OR EMPLOYEE OF THE U.S. A PARTY? (SEE 28 USC 2403) REQUIRED TO BE HEARD AND DETERMINED BY A DISTRICT COURT OF THREE JUDGES PURSUAN NO ES IN THIS ACTION RESIDE IN THE CENTRAL SECTION OF THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS (I EE LOCAL RULE 40.1(CI)). YES	VORCES BERKSH ONS OF CCTION I
PUBL IF SO IS TH 22 US DO A COUT FRAN DO A DISTI THE IN W	IC INTERI , IS THE U IS CASE R C 22412 LL PARTIE STY) - (SE IKLIN, HA LL OF THE RICH SEC RY OF THE	U.S.A. OR AN OFFICER, AGENT OR EMPLOYEE OF THE U.S. A PARTY? (SEE 28 USC 2403) REQUIRED TO BE HEARD AND DETERMINED BY A DISTRICT COURT OF THREE JUDGES PURSUAN NO. LES IN THIS ACTION RESIDE IN THE CENTRAL SECTION OF THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS (IN THE WESTERN SECTION (IN THE WESTERN SECTION (IN THE WESTERN SECTION (IN THE PARTIES RESIDING IN MASSACHUSETTS RESIDE IN THE CENTRAL AND/OR WESTERN SECTION (IN THE PARTIES RESIDE) TO RESIDE? CITION DO THE ONLY PARTIES RESIDING IN MASSACHUSETTS RESIDE? LE PARTIES ARE THE UNITED STATES, COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, OR ANY GOVERNMENT.	WORCES BERKSH ONS OF
PUBL IF SO IS TH 28 US DO A COUNTED TRAM DO A DISTI THE IN W AGEI	IC INTERI 1. IS THE U 1. IS CASE R C 2241 LL PARTIE STY) - (SEI BLLIV. HA LL OF TH RICH SEC NY OF THI NCY OF TH	U.S.A. OR AN OFFICER, AGENT OR EMPLOYEE OF THE U.S. A PARTY? (SEE 28 USC 2403) REQUIRED TO BE HEARD AND DETERMINED BY A DISTRICT COURT OF THREE JUDGES PURSUAN NO. LES IN THIS ACTION RESIDE IN THE CENTRAL SECTION OF THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS (IN THE WESTERN SECTION (IN THE WESTERN SECTIO	WORCES BERKSH ONS OF
PUBL IF SO IS TH 28 US DO A COUNTED TRAM DO A DISTI THE IN W AGEI	IC INTERI 1. IS THE U 1. IS CASE R C 2241 LL PARTIE STY) - (SEI BLLIV. HA LL OF TH RICH SEC NY OF THI NCY OF TH	U.S.A. OR AN OFFICER, AGENT OR EMPLOYEE OF THE U.S. A PARTY? (SEE 28 USC 2403) REQUIRED TO BE HEARD AND DETERMINED BY A DISTRICT COURT OF THREE JUDGES PURSUAN NO. LES IN THIS ACTION RESIDE IN THE CENTRAL SECTION OF THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS (IN THE WESTERN SECTION (IN THE WESTERN SECTION (IN THE WESTERN SECTION (IN THE PARTIES RESIDING IN MASSACHUSETTS RESIDE IN THE CENTRAL AND/OR WESTERN SECTION (IN THE PARTIES RESIDE) TO RESIDE? CITION DO THE ONLY PARTIES RESIDING IN MASSACHUSETTS RESIDE? LE PARTIES ARE THE UNITED STATES, COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, OR ANY GOVERNMENT.	WORCES BERKSH ONS OF
PUBL IF SO IS THE 28 US DO A COUNT FRANCE DO A DISTI THEE IN W AGE	IC INTERIOR INTERIOR INTERIOR INTERIOR SECURITATION OF THE INCY OF	U.S.A. OR AN OFFICER, AGENT OR EMPLOYEE OF THE U.S. A PARTY? (SEE 28 USC 2403) REQUIRED TO BE HEARD AND DETERMINED BY A DISTRICT COURT OF THREE JUDGES PURSUAN NO. LES IN THIS ACTION RESIDE IN THE CENTRAL SECTION OF THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS (IN EXAMPLE MODILITY OF MASSACHUSETTS (IN THE WESTERN SECTION (IN THE	WORCES BERKSH ONS OF
PUBLIF SO IS THE 28 US DO A DISTITUTE IN W	IC INTERI IS THE U IS CASE R C 22M; LL PARTIE ILL OF THE RICH SEC NY OF THE NCY OF	U.S.A. OR AN OFFICER, AGENT OR EMPLOYEE OF THE U.S. A PARTY? (SEE 28 USC 2403) REQUIRED TO BE HEARD AND DETERMINED BY A DISTRICT COURT OF THREE JUDGES PURSUAN NO. LES IN THIS ACTION RESIDE IN THE CENTRAL SECTION OF THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS (IN EXAMPLE MODILITY OF MASSACHUSETTS (IN THE WESTERN SECTION (IN THE	WORCES BERKSH ONS OF